CORRELATION BETWEEN COURSE SCORES AND TUTEP SCORES

Bambang Wijaya, Sudarsono, Regina
Masters Study Program of English Language Education, Teacher Training
And Education Faculty, Tanjungpura University, Pontianak
Email: bambangwijaya@yahoo.co.id

Abstract: This study investigated the correlation between Course Scores and TUTEP scores of the graduates of English Education Study Program, Teacher Training and Education Faculty, Tanjungpura University in Calendar Year 2013. It also investigated the relationship between all related course scores (Listening, Structure, and Reading courses) and the TUTEP section scores (Listening, Structure and Written Expression, and Reading Sections). The sample of 79 students for the study which consisted of 54 Regular A and 25 Regular B students was drawn using cluster random sampling technique. The course scores and the TUTEP scores were analyzed, first, to ensure no violation of correlation procedure, and, second, using Pearson Product Moment Procedures through the use of SPSS Version 17.0 to yield the results of the study.The results of the study showed that there were significant positive linear correlations: between Course Scores and TUTEP Scores (r = 0.589 at 0.01 level); between Structure Course Scores and Structure and Written Expression TUTEP Section Scores (r = 0.323 at 0.01 level); between Reading Course Scores and Reading TUTEP Section Scores (r = 0.266 at 0.05 level); and between Listening Course Scores and Listening TUTEP Section Scores (r = 0.495 at 0.01 level).
Keywords: Correlation Study, TOEFL, TUTEP.

Abstrak: Penelitian ini tentang korelasi antara nilai mata kuliah dan nilai TUTEP pada Lulusan S-1 Program Studi Bahasa Inggris, Fakultas Keguruan dan Ilmu Pendidikan (FKIP), Universitas Tanjungpura (UNTAN) pada tahun kalender 2013. Penelitian ini juga menyangkut hubungan antara semua nilai mata kuliah (Listening, Reading dan Structure) dan nilai TUTEP (Listening, Reading dan Structure and Written Expression). 79 sampel yang terdiri dari 54 Reguler A dan 25 Reguler B diambil dengan teknik cluster random sampling. Nilai mata kuliah dan nilai TUTEP dioleh untuk menentukan pemenuhan syarat korelasi, dan kemudian dianalisa dengan rumus Pearson Prudyct Moment melalui SPSS versi 17.0. Hasil penelitian ini menunjukkan bahwa terdapat korelasi linier positif yang significant: antara total nilai mata kuliah dan total nilai TUTEP (r = 0.589 pada tingkat alpha 0.01); antara nilai mata kuliah structure dan nilai TUTEP bagian Structure and Written Expression (r=0.323 pada tingkat alpha 0.01); antara nilai mata kuliah Reading dan nilai TUTEP bagian Reading (r=0.266 pada tingkat alpha 0.05); dan antara nilai mata kuliah Listening dan nilai TUTEP bagian Listening (r=0.495 pada tingkat alpha 0.01).
Kata Kunci: Studi Korelasi, TOEFL, TUTEP.

English plays an important role as a means of communication, and as language used in education. Furthermore it is also used as a measure of proficiency in various levels of education. At Tanjungpura University (UNTAN), English proficiency is measured through TUTEP (Tanjungpura University Test of English

Proficiency) which is identical to TOEFL ITP (Test of English as a Foreign Language, Institutional Testing Program).

TOEFL (Test of English as Foreign Language) is one of the most widely used testing tools to measure the level of English language proficiency of non-native English language speakers. Since its commencement, TOEFL has undergone some changes. In 2005, the TOEFL iBT has replaced the computer-based test (CBT), which was discontinued in September 2006, and the paper-based tests (PBT) which is still offered only in locations where testing via internet is not available. The paper-based test called TOEFL ITP is offered in selected area, like in Indonesia. The TOEFL ITP has the following sections: a) Listening Comprehension; b) Structure and Written Expression; c) Reading Comprehension. The TOEFL ITP scores range between 310 to 677, while the TOEFL iBT test is scored on a scale of 0 to 120 points(www.ets.org/toeflitp). There is no passing score on the TOEFL test, but various institutions have their own TOEFL score requirements.

In order to enhance the quality of UNTAN (Tanjungpura University) graduates, the English language teaching policy of The Rector of UNTAN requires all students to get the TOEFL test (excluding the writing) which is known as TUTEP conducted by UPT Bahasa (Language Center) as one of the requirements to sit in the thesis examination with certain level of English proficiency for certain study programs at UNTAN. The TUTEP test items are identical to the format of the TOEFL ITP test with certain purposes for each section. The purpose of Listening Comprehension is to demonstrate the students' ability to understand spoken English; Structure and Written Expressions is to demonstrate the students' ability to recognize grammatically correct English; Reading Comprehension is to demonstrate the students' ability to understand written English, and Writing is to demonstrate the student ability to produce correct, organized, and meaningful English. To sit in the thesis examination, the UNTAN students are required to take the basic test, namely Listening Comprehension, Structure and Written Expressions, and Reading Comprehension sections.

The English Language Education Study Program students (both Regular A and Regular B) of Teacher Training and Education Faculty (FKIP), Tanjungpura University must show the TUTEP score of at least 480 points to sit in the thesis examination. If the students cannot reach this level of English proficiency after several attempts of TUTEP tests, they must join the TUTEP training, and get the certificate of the training as the "passport" to sit in the thesis examination, although the TUTEP training score is still below 480 points. This policy is introduced to enable the students to sit in the thesis examination after attending the test several times but still failed to reach the minimum defined score, 480.

The 2006/2007 curriculum of the English Language Education Study Program of FKIP UNTAN comprises some courses that are in line with the TUTEP sections: a) three Structure courses and one Syntax course; b) four Reading courses; and c) three Listening courses. These courses are to provide students with the ability to listen, to read, and to use grammar appropriately and correctly.

Based on the objectives of the above courses, the students are designed to gain enough proficiency to "pass" the TUTEP for thesis examination. In other words, the English Language Education Study Program students should not have faced problems in reaching 480 points of TUTEP test. Nevertheless, based on a

research done by Uray Salam, Ph.D.(2010), the vast majority of 2005-batch students got the TUTEP scores below 480. It shows that the English language Education Study Program students still find problems in reaching the minimum score.

As mentioned above that TUTEP is, in fact, the copy of TOEFL or TOEFL ITP, the discussion of TOEFL means TUTEP. Since TOEFL has been widely used to assess student academic potential, several studies have been conducted to determine whether TOEFL scores can serve as predictor of success in undergraduate and graduate schools, and whether there is a correlation between TOEFL scores and Grade Point Average (GPA). However, the results have varied. Among the researchers, Light, Xu and Mossop (1987), Johnson (1988), Wimberley, McCloud and Flinn (1992), Menka E.Neal (1998), and Marc Manganello, Master Thesis, (2011) found a significant positive correlation (but not strong) between TOEFL and GPA. On the other hand, Ayer and Quattlebaum (1992), Nelson, Nelson and Maloner (2004), Woodrow (2006), Jacob(2007) found out no relationship between TOEFL and GPA. Then, Ayers and Quanttlebaum (1991), Nelson, Nelson and Malone (2004) also found that the TOEFL was not a good or effective predictor of academic success, but House, Johnson, and Tolone (1987) found out that TOEFL scores had a weak predictor to academic success.

The implementation of the TUTEP test (previously called TOEFL Prediction) for all UNTAN thesis examination candidates has been based on the assumption that the graduates should have a threshold level of English proficiency to enhance the quality of the graduates in order to face the tight competition in the era of globalization. However, the correlation between course scores and TUTEP scores has not been clearly established. As far as such a study is concerned, no research has been conducted at UNTAN on the relationships between course scores and TUTEP scores. Thus, it is important to study whether or not the course scores relate significantly to the TUTEP scores and whether or not course scores serve as a significant predictor to TUTEP scores of the graduates, at English language Education Study Program, Teacher Training and Education Faculty, Tanjungpura University in Pontianak.

In addition, this study uses the scores of three groups of courses students obtained as a relative measure of their performance to relate to the three sections of the TUTEP scores, whereas the previous studies were mostly about overall TOEFL scores and graduate GPAs. Then, most studies mentioned above have been quite old and done in abroad colleges or universities, thus, whether or not the research findings may still be applicable to the present condition, or whether or not the results of this study support the previous studies. Finally, by knowing the correlations, furthermore, this study may continue to analyze the prediction of TUTEP score through the course scores and may shed light on the degree of connection between the skills taught in courses and the skill requirement of TUTEP, and may serve to trigger the students to better prepare themselves both in course process and in facing the TUTEP test.

METHOD

This research applies a descriptive method with a correlation design and uses documentary analysis technique through gathering information of the student scores in three courses (Listening, Reading and Structure courses), and the TUTEP scores

in three sections (Listening Comprehension, Structure and Written Expressions, and Reading Comprehension sections). The raw data which are in the form of interval scale are collected and recorded in tables. The reason to choose correlation design is that a) the data of the two variables cannot be manipulated/changed, and b) this correlation study shows a relationship between two variables which can, then, lead to the discovery of the cause and effect relationship through experimental methods, and c) the result of correlation study enable us to predict the probable result from the course scores. In other words, this research serves as the initial step for further researches.

Correlation study usually serves as initial research of conducting cause and effect research or experimental research. If two variables are found positively correlated, then, we can continue to do further research to find out which variable causes which. The result of correlation study is in form of correlation coefficient (*r*) which may take on any value between +1 and -1. The sign of the correlation coefficient indicates that the scores on two variables tend to change together. Positive (direct) relationship shows that high scores on one variable are associated with high scores on the other, but negative (inverse) relationship shows that high scores on one variable are associated with low scores on the other. A value of 0 shows that there is no relationship/association between the two variables (sets of scores). A "meaningful" relationship indicates that the scores tend to change each other more closely, that is, the more meaningful, the more closely you can predict the change in one by knowing the change in the other. Thus, the *r* is a measure of the degree of the linear relationship between two variables, usually labeled X and Y. The Pearson correlation coefficient indicates how far away all these data points are to the line of best fit (how well the data points fit his new model/line of best fit). The two variables in a correlation study can be measured in entirely different units. Indeed, the calculations for Pearson's correlation coefficient were designed such that the units of measurement do not affect the calculation. This allows the correlation coefficient to be comparable and not influenced by the units of the variables used. Statistically significant *r* implies that it reflects a true, rather than due to chance, correlation in the population, and the significance levels indicate how likely a result is due to chance. In statistics, we use the *"p"* value or alpha value to indicate significance. In research of social and humanistic sciences, we usually use the alpha at 0.05, meaning that the result has a five percent chance of not being true, which is the opposite of a 95% chance of being true.

A correlation can be one-tailed or two-tailed. One-tailed hypothesis is one that specifies the direction of the correlation, while two-tailed hypothesis is one that does not. For example, in this research the hypothesis states, "There is a positive correlation between course scores and TUTEP scores." It is one-tailed. On the other hand, the two tailed hypothesis will state "There is a correlation between course scores and TUTEP scores." This is important in statistics because if we are projecting the direction, we will look for the 5% difference (if alpha is 0.05) in only one tail. But, if we are not projecting the direction, we will split the 5% between the two tails, meaning we can only reject the null hypothesis if the critical value in the upper or lower 2.5% of the tails. The practical significance of one- tailed versus two-tailed hypothesis is that the researcher can use a smaller sample to test a one-tailed hypothesis. Using a smaller sample often reduces the cost and is less time consuming for the researcher. In summary, the levels of significance for a two-

tailed test in this study were calculated using the critical values for Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient.

The population of this research is all the S-1 English Education Study Program graduates, covering Regular A and Regular B programs, but excluding the Ketapang Regency class and in-service teacher class, who have passed the thesis examinations and who are required to have TUTEP score as one of the requirement for thesis examination. The number of the population (graduates) is shown in Table 1.

Table 1
The Number of Population since the commencement of TUTEP Test

Year	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	Total
Graduates	74	85	59	76	138	106	120	79	737

The number of graduates as shown in Table 1. are of Regular A and Regular B. The sample of this research was drawn from the population, 737 graduates, by using cluster random sampling techniques, and the graduates of 2013 in Calendar Year 2013 was chosen and covered three periods of inaugurations, which can be seen in the table below.

Table 2
The number of Sample of This Research

INAUGURATION PERIODS of 2013	REGULAR A	REGULAR B	TOTAL
First	11	3	14
Second	26	17	43
Third	17	5	22
Total	54	25	79

Thus, the sample of this research numbered 79 students who have passed the thesis examinations in Calendar Year of 2013. A total of 79 graduates were included in the analysis of this study. Of those graduates, 54 were Regular A (68%) and 25 were Regular B (32%). There are 52 female (66%) and 27 male (34%).

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Findings

The research findings are presented as follows.

a. The correlation coefficient of Total Course Scores and Total TUTEP Scores is +0.589. It is positive significant at the 0.01 level based on two-tailed test (the critical value is 0.2830) and automatically it is also significant at the 0.05 level (the critical value is 0.2172). The correlation is interpreted as substantial association or high correlation. Furthermore, the Coefficient of Determination is 0.346 (*r* squared). It means that 34.6% of the variance on Course Scores is shared with TUTEP scores or there is 34.6% proportion of overlapping variance between Course scores and TUTEP scores. By extension, It is not known what the remaining 65.4% on each test is related to, thus, belonging to extraneous or confounding variables. In term of prediction, the total course scores can help to explain 34.6% of variance in the TUTEP scores.

b. The correlation between Listening course scores and Listening TUTEP Section scores was run using Pearson Product-Moment correlation coefficient in the SPSS version 17.0. The result shows a significant positive correlation (two tailed) between the two variables both at the level of 0.01 and 0.05, r=+0.495, n=79, p<.05 (0.495>0.2172), and p<0.01 (0.495>0.2830). From the kurtosis point of view, the platykurtic (flat) distribution shows that the course scores are distributed well from low to high scores, but the TUTEP scores tended to be distributed to the lower scores. In other words, most students who got both high scores and low scores in Listening course, tended to get low TUTEP scores. This means that the correlation between the two variables is quite meaningful or beyond the expected range of chance fluctuation. In term of prediction the coefficient of determination is 24.5% in which Listening course scores can help to predict Listening TUTEP scores although there is 75.5% area of darkness that is due to the other factors or variables which need further investigation.

c. The correlation coefficient of Structure course scores and Structure and Written Expression TUTEP section scores is +0.323. It is a moderate or intermediate significant positive correlation between the two variables, r=+0.323, n=79, p<.01 (0.323 > 0.2830), and It is also significant at p<.05 (0.323 > 0.2172), with high course scores are associated with high TUTEP scores, and low course scores are associated with low TUTEP scores. Furthermore, the coefficient of Determination is 0.104 (r squared). It means that 10.4% of the variance on course scores was shared with TUTEP scores or there was 10.4% proportion of overlapping variance between course scores and TUTEP scores. By extension, it is not known what the remaining 89.6% on each test is related to. Thus, it belongs to extraneous or confounding variables. In term of prediction, Structure course scores can help to explain 10.4% of variance in Structure and Written Expression TUTEP scores.

d. The computation of correlation between Reading course scores and Reading TUTEP section scores has been analyzed through SPSS version 17.0. The result shows a moderate/intermediate significant positive correlation between the two variables, r=+0.266, n=79, p<.05 (0.266 > 0.2172), but non significant at the level of p<.01 (0.266 < 0.2830), with high course scores are associated with high TUTEP scores, and low course scores are associated with low TUTEP scores. Furthermore, the coefficient of Determination is 0.070 (r squared). It means that 7% of the variance on course scores was shared with TUTEP scores or there was 7% proportion of overlapping variance between course scores and TUTEP scores. By extension, It is not known what the remaining 93% on each test is related to. Thus, it belongs to extraneous or confounding variables. In term of prediction, Reading course scores can help to explain only 7% of variance in Reading TUTEP scores.

Discussions

The computations of four research problems, one main research problem and three sub research problems, using Pearson Product Moment correlation formula through the use of SPSS Version 17.0 can be summarized and presented in the table below.

Table 3
Summary of all computations

No	Variables	Mean	SD	*r*	Level	r^2
1	Total Course	224.95	13.281	0.589 High	Sig.0.01 & 0.05	34.60%
2	Total TUTEP	486.73	44.206			
3	Structure Course	73.75	5.014	0.323 Moder ate	Sig.0.01 & 0.05	10.43%
4	Structure TUTEP	49.42	5.904			
5	Reading Course	75.16	5.055	0.266 Low	Sig.0.05	7.07%
6	Reading TUTEP	48.54	5.493			
7	Listening Course	75.78	6.424	0.495 High	Sig. 0.01 & 0.05	24.50%
8	Listening TUTEP	48.04	5.441			

From the above table, it can be seen that, in general, the results of the present investigation show that the relationships among the variables indicated low to high or substantial positive correlations between the scores obtained from courses and TUTEP.

In summary, positive, significant, substantial or high statistically relationships have been revealed to exist between the performances on total course scores and total TUTEP scores ($r = 0.589$). This result means that the total course scores are quite sufficient serving as predictor of the total TUTEP scores. Meanwhile, the correlation between Structure scores and Structure and Written expression TUTEP section scores resulted in $r = 0.323$ which is positive significant moderate correlation. This means that the students with high score in Structure courses are likely to have high scores in Structure and Written Expression TUTEP section scores. Furthermore, the correlation between Reading course scores and Reading TUTEP section scores resulted in $r = 0.266$ which is only significant at 0.05 level but non-significant at 0.01 level. Finally, the correlation coefficient of 0.495 of Listening course score and Listening TUTEP section score shows a positive significant correlation. This means that Listening course scores can be used to predict Listening TUTEP scores due to the high significant correlation.

From the overlapping standpoint, majority of the variance (65.4% in total scores, 89.6% in Structure scores, 93% in Reading scores, and 75.5% in Listening scores) may be attributed to other factors such as aptitude, motivation, skills, adaptability, emotional security, and so on which need further investigations on the "area of darkness".

This study offers some evidence that the assessments of course scores and TUTEP scores were measuring sufficiently similar constructs or specific skills, but, in order to increase the role of courses to support TUTEP scores, it is suggested to the teachers of the concerned courses to review and to compare the skills required

in the TUTEP tests and possibly to include them in the course objectives. Then, the policy of the idea that TUTEP scores should be used as one of the requirement to sit in thesis examinations in order to increase the graduates' added values to compete in the global competition should be reconsidered. Nevertheless, TUTEP scores do provide institutions or the Study Program with useful information about the students' abilities, performance in previous course works, especially if the course works have been done in English, like English Language Education Study Program, it is likely to be a far stronger indicator if the TUTEP scores serve as continuous tests of every year (two semesters) which means that the students will at least have four TUTEP scores during their study. In the long run, this helps students become familiar with the test in order to prepare the students to take TUTEP. Doing this allows the individual student to keep track of their scores or improvement. If there is an increase of scores from one test to the other test, then, this can serve as the indicator of improvement and it serves as the proof to sit in thesis examinations as the complement of the certificate of training with score below 480.

If we observe the results from the ordinal standpoint, we see that the means of course scores (see Table 3 above) are ranked as Listening (the first, 75.78), Reading (the second, 75.16), and Structure (the third, 73.75). While the means of the TUTEP scores are ranked as Structure (the first, 49.42), Reading (the second, 48.54), and Listening (the third, 48.04). This phenomenon is interesting because the ranking of means from the two sets of tests resulted in the contradictory ranks. The Reading scores are constant both from the course and from the TUTEP, but Listening and Structures scores are exactly the opposite in ranking. This is an interesting issue to investigate further.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

Conclusion

The conclusion is presented in accord with the research problems stated in the previous chapter as follows: (a) The correlation between overall course score and overall TUTEP score shows substantial or high positive significant correlation (r = 0.589) which can be summed up that the two tests measure the more or less similar skills. Furthermore, the hypothesis testing shows that the Ho is rejected and the Ha is accepted at the alpha level of 0.05 and 0.01. Then, the TUTEP score can be predicted substantially from the course score. (b) The correlation between Structure course score and Structure and Written Expression TUTEP section score shows moderate positive significant correlation (r = 0.323). Then, the hypothesis testing shows that the Ho is rejected and the Ha is accepted at the alpha level of 0.05 and 0.01. Thus, the course score can be used moderately to predict the TUTEP score. (c) The correlation between Reading course score and Reading TUTEP section score shows low positive significant correlation (r = 0.266). Then, the Ho is rejected and the Ha is accepted at the alpha level of 0.05. Thus, the course score can still be used to predict the TUTEP score only in the alpha level of 0.05. (d) The correlation between Listening course score and Listening TUTEP section score shows substantial significant correlation (r = 0.495). Thus, the Ho is rejected, and the Ha is accepted at the alpha level of 0.01 and 0.05. Course score can be used substantially to predict TUTEP score. From the four correlation coefficients, it can be concluded that, in general, course scores correlate positively with TUTEP scores.

This means that the two tests measure more or less similar constructs or skills. Thus, the better scores of courses the students have will have better scores in TUTEP. In other words, the course scores can be used as predictor of TUTEP scores. By extension, the total course score can be used to predict total TUTEP scores in 34.6%. Structure course score can be used to predict Structure and Written Expression TUTEP score in 10.43%. Reading course score can be used to predict Reading TUTEP section score in 7.07%. Finally, the Listening course score can be used to predict Listening TUTEP section score in 24.5%.

Suggestion

Based on the discussion and the conclusion, some suggestions are put forward: (a) Due to the positive correlation coefficients, it is suggested that the students should increase their performance in Structure, Reading, and Listening courses in order to have better scores in TUTEP. (b) The students are suggested to improve their TUTEP scores by intensive practice of joining TUTEP trial tests. (c) The lecturers are suggested to adapt their teaching to the skills and format of TUTEP in order to help students to be familiar with the TUTEP, for example, by giving similar TUTEP test formats in the formative tests. (d) The English Language Study Program can maintain or increase the TUTEP trial tests more frequently (once a year) in order to keep track of the students' proficiency.

REFERENCES

Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., & Sorensen, C. (2010). *Introduction to Research in Education. Eight Edition.* Belmont: Wadsworth.

Ayers, J., & Quattlebaum, R. (1992). TOEFL Performance and Success in a Master's Program in Engineering. *Educational and Psychological Measurement 52(4)* , 973-975.

Black, J. (1991). Performance in English Skills Course and Overall Academic Acvhievement. *TESL Canada Journal 9(1)* , 42-46.

Brown, J.D. (1977). Statistics Corner: Skewness and Kurtosis. *Shiken: JALT Testing & Evaluation SIG Newsletter 1(1),* 20-23.

Butler, S. M., & McMunn, N. D. (2006). *A Teacher's Guide to Classroom Assessment: Understanding and Using Assessment to Improve Student Learning.* San Fransisco: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

ETS. (2014). Linking Classroom Assessment with Student Learning. *Educational Testing Service* . USA: www.ets.org.

ETS. (2010). TOEFL ITP Assessment Series. *Educational Testing Service* . USA: www.ets.org/toeflitp.

FKIP UNTAN. (2013). *Pedoman Akademik FKIP UNTAN. Edisi ke-8.* Pontianak: FKIP UNTAN.

FKIP UNTAN. (2013). *Pedoman Penulisan Karya Ilmiah: Skripsi, Tesis, Artikel, Makalah, L:aporan Penelitian FKIP UNTAN. Edisi Revisi.* Pontianak: FKIP UNTAN.

FKIP UNTAN. (2010). *Pedoman Umum Penulisan Tesis Magister S2 Pendidikan di Lingkungan FKIP UNTAN. Edisi Pertama.* Pontianak: FKIP UNTAN.

Gries, S. (2013). *Statistics for Linguistics with R. Second Revised Edition.* Berlin: de Gruyter Mouton.

Hinkle, D. E., Wiersma, W., & Jurs, S. G. (1988). *Applied Statistics for the Behavioral Scviences.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

House, D., Johnson, J., & Tolone, W. (1987). Predictive Validity of Graduate Record Examination Scores for Performance in Selected Graduate Psychology Courses. *Psychology Reports. (60)* , 107-110.

IIEF. (2010). *TOEFL ITP Assessment Series, Practice tests. Volume 1.* Jakarta: Penerbit Erlangga.

Jacob, N. N. (2007). *TOEFL: Good Indicator for Student Success at Community College? A Doctoral Dissertation.* Oregon: Oregon State University.

Johnson, P. (1988). English Language proficiency and Academic Performance of Undergraduate International Students. *TESOL Quarterly (22)* , 164-168.

Light, R., Xu, M., & Mossop, J. (1987). English Proficiency and Academic Performance of International Students. *TESOL Quarterly (21)* , 252-261.

Mackey, A., & Gass, S. M. (2012). *Research Methods in Second Language Acquisition: A Practical Guide, First Edition.* UK: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Mangarello, M. (2011). *Correlation in the New TOEFL Era: An Investigation of the Statistical Relationships between iBT Scores, Placement Test Performance, and Academic Success of International Students at Iowa State University. A Master Thesis.* Ames, Iowa: Digital Repository @ Iowa State University.

Neal, M. E. (1998). *The Predictive Validity of the GRE and TOEFL Exams with GPA as the Criterion of Graduate Suiccess for International Graduate Students in Science and Engineering.* USA: ERIC (ED424294).

Nelson, C., Nelson, J., & Malone, B. (2004). Predicting Success of International Graduate Studies in an American University. *College and University Journal (80)* , 19-24.

Pallant, J. (2007). *SPSS Survival Manual: A Step-by-step Guide to Data Analysis Using SPSS for Windows (Version 15). Third Edition.* Australia: Allen & Unwin.

Phillips, D. (2001). *Longman Complete Course for the TOEFL Test: preparation for the Computer and Paper Tests.* N.Y.: Longman.

Pusat Penjaminan Mutu, U. (2009). *Peraturan Akademik Universitas Tanjungpura: Bidang Penelitian, Bidang Pengabdian Kepada Masyarakat.* Pontianak: UNTAN.

Runyon, R. P., & Haber, A. (1991). *Fundamentals of Behavioral Statistics. Seventh Edition.* New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

Salam, U., Fergina, A., & Suparjan. (2012). Kebijakan TOEFL di Universitas Tanjungpura: Analisis Kasus: Sebuah Konten Analisis. *Jurnal Visi Ilmu Pendidikan, 28(2),* pp.13-25. ISSN 1410-2826.

Service, E. T. (2014, November Thursday). Linking Classroom Assessment with Student Learning. *Educational Testing Service* , pp. 1-3.

Wimberley, D., McCloud, D., & Flinn, W. (1992). Focus on International Students in the United States: Predicting Success of Indonesian Graduate Students in the United States. *Comparative Education Review (36)* , 487-508.

Woodrow, L. (2006). Academic Success of International Postgraduate Education Students and the Role of English Proficiency. *University of Sydney Papers in TESOL (1)* , 51-70.